EQUAL RIGHTS

"MEN AND WOMEN SHALL HAVE EQUAL RIGHTS THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES AND EVERY PLACE SUBJECT TO ITS JURISDICTION"

Amendment to the United States Constitution now before Congress.

MAR 16 1938

Statement Of Mary Murray Before Senate Committee

Early American Pioneers Of The Woman Movement

By MARY WILHELMINE WILLIAMS
Professor of History, Goucher College

Chrystal Macmillan Memorial

By ERICA BUTLER-BOWDON
Geneva Representative Open Door International

March 15, 1938

NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY

Washington, D. C.

Vol. 24, No. 6 **Price Five Cents**

Equal Rights

Official Organ
of the
NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY
Capitol, Hill Washington, D. C.
Phone Atlantic 1210
Published Semi-Monthly at
144 B Street, N. E., Washington, D. C.
and Printed at
406 W. Redwood Street, Baltimore, Md.
Entered as second-class matter at the post-office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879.
Subscription, $1.00 a Year
Foreign Subscription, $1.50

HELEN HUNT WEST . . . . . Editor

CONTRIBUTORS
ALMA LUTZ EMILY PERRY
EDITH HOUGHTON HOOKER
ETHEL ADAMS CROSBY, Circulation Chairman
GERTRUDE I. GEORGE, Advertising Manager
ADVERTISING REPRESENTATIVES
MACFARLAND AND HEATON, 287 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY
Chairman, Mrs. Stephen Pell, N. Y.
Vice-Chairmen:
Gail Laughlin, Me. Anita Pollitzer, S. C.
Jane Norman Smith, N. Y.
Secretary, Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, D. C.
Treasurer, Laura M. Berrien, Ga.

Ethel Adamson, N. J.
Nina Allender, D. C.
Edwina Austin Avery, D. C.
Rebekah S. Greathouse, D. C.
Elsie M. Hill, Conn.
Florence Bayard Hilles, Del.
Edith Houghton Hooker, Md.
Inez Haynes Irwin, N. Y.
Elizabeth T. Kent, Calif.
Lola Maverick Lloyd, Ill.
Alma Lutz, Mass.
Burnita Shelton Matthews, Miss.
Mrs. Frederick L. Ransome, Calif.
Mary Murray, N. Y.
Dora G. Ogle, Md.
Alice Paul, N. J.
Doris Stevens, N. Y.
Betty Gram Swing, Conn.
Anne Bayard Underwood, D. C.
Margaret C. Williams, Conn.
Helen Clegg Winters, Ohio
Clara Snell Wolfe, Ohio

NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY

OBJECT

To secure for women complete equality with men under the law and in all human relationships—in particular to secure the adoption of the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution, and the adherence of the United States to the Equal Rights Treaty. The Woman's Party also supports the proposed Equality Amendments to the Covenant of the League of Nations.

THE PROPOSED EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

"Art. 1—Men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction.

"Art. 2—Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Introduced

Senate—By Senator Townsend (Del.), and Senator Burke, (Neb.), Feb. 5, 1937, (Senate Joint Resolution No. 65).

House—By Representative Ludlow, (Ind.), Jan. 5, 1937, (House Joint Resolution No. 1).

Present Status

Senate—Before Judiciary Committee; favorable report by sub-judiciary committee June 23, 1937.

House—Before Judiciary Committee; favorable report by sub-judiciary committee June 16,1937.

THE EQUAL RIGHTS TREATY

"Art. 1—The contracting States agree that upon the ratification of this Treaty men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the territory subject to their respective jurisdictions."

Signed

By Cuba, Ecuador, Paraguay, and Uruguay, at Montevido, December, 1933.

PROPOSED EQUALITY AMENDMENTS TO COVENANT OF LEAGUE OF NATIONS

"The members of the League undertake that in their respective countries the right of vote shall not be denied or abridged on the ground of sex."

"The members of the League undertake that in their respective countries there shall be no distinction based on sex in their law and practice regarding nationality."

"The members of the League undertake that in their respective countries men and women shall have equal rights in all other fields."

"The members of the League undertake that there shall be both men and women, with full voting powers, in all delegations to the Council and Assembly of the League and to all Conferences under the auspices of the League."

Present Status

Before the League of Nations Committee on Status of Women.

Guaranteeing Basic Rights

MUCH has been said about the proper method of securing for women of the United States the right to have the law apply to them just as it applies to other citizens. The National Woman's Party and eleven other national organizations of women, have fixed upon the proposed Equal Rights Amendment to the Federal Constitution as the best means of accomplishing this. Those who oppose the amendment claim that they are not opposed to equal rights but only to the amendment method. They advocate securing the same objective by equalizing state laws.

Since the proponents and opponents of the amendment method are agreed that laws discriminating unjustly against women should be eliminated, it might be well to ascertain just where these two groups differ.

The National Woman's Party does not oppose the equalizing of state laws. On the contrary it approves all methods of securing equality and has in many instances brought about the equalizing of laws within the individual states. However, the Party knows that there is no permanency with the state by state method, and that the legislature in each state is free at any time to return to the statute books the discriminatory laws women have been fortunate in eliminating. It also knows that with an Equal Rights Amendment in the Constitution, these laws could not be returned. The amendment would fix the principle of equal rights.

When the United States was in the making, our forefathers, in order to protect the rights of the individual and guard against infringement upon these rights, laid down a set of basic principles determining the point beyond which legislative bodies could not go in restricting the individual by law. In other words, these basic principles secured to the individual certain rights declared to be inalienable.

At the time these basic principles were laid down, women were not citizens, and in the light of the old English Common law upon which our law was founded, were still regarded as chattel. In 1920 they became citizens, but the basic principle of equal rights with other citizens, guaranteed men by the Constitution, still is not guaranteed women.

Since the Constitution merely lays down a set of rules under which Government operates, and defines the basic rights of those comprising the Government, its provisions should cover all citizens. Through the suffrage amendment women, a new group, became a part of the Government. The original document did not include for them a basic guarantee of equal rights with other citizens. Now, in all reason it should do so.

The framers of the Constitution deemed "equal protection" a basic right and included it in the Constitution. The Constitution secures to the individual state the right to handle its own internal affairs, but the rules of the governmental game, as laid down in the Constitution, must be followed. Women are not the problem of the states any more than are men. Citizenship is national. They are citizens of the United States, and as such their rights should be determined in the basic law. In other words, the rules of the governmental game should apply to all alike.

The difference between the state by state method and the Constitutional method of securing for women equal rights with men under law, is clear. The amendment method is basic and establishes a rule of government. The state by state method leaves women to the not always so tender mercies of ever changing state legislatures composed almost entirely of men, many of whom have not yet entirely discarded the old Common Law idea that they are chattel.

Statement Of Mary Murray Before Senate Committee

PRESIDENT OF THE BROOKLYN-MANHATTAN TRANSIT WOMEN'S LEAGUE OF NEW YORK, TESTIFIES AT EQUAL RIGHTS HEARING

MR. CHAIRMAN and gentlemen of the committee, I was left a widow many years ago with five children, the eldest being seven years and the youngest being one year. The money from the insurance company paid the expenses of my husband's funeral, but there was nothing left. Of course, I had to get a job to support myself and my children.

For the past thirty years I have been a ticket agent on the Brooklyn-Manhattan Transit Railroad. Today I am a grandmother of four healthy grandchildren and I am still working.

During those many years on the railroad I have associated with working women in every walk of life —the factory, the store, the shop, the office, and the railroad—and, Mr. Chairman, I am honest with you, I am sincere when I tell you that those many hundreds of wage-earning women have been and are for the Equal Rights Amendment, knowing that their only hope for an equal chance with men to earn their livelihood lies therein.

For the past nineteen years I have been president of the Brooklyn-Manhattan Transit Women's League. I want you to know that there is no salary attached to this office. It is a working women's organization. This organization of ours came into existence nineteen years ago because one of those so-called protective laws threw out of work on the railroad almost 3,000 women just in New York City and Brooklyn. It was a most pitiful sight. There were widows with dependents, women with an invalid son or daughter, and women who were the sole support of aged parents.

SENATOR HATCH: May I interrupt you a minute?

MRS. MURRAY: Yes, sir.

SENATOR HATCH: Did you say "as a result of protective legislation"?

MRS. MURRAY: Yes; as a result of the Lockwood-Caulfield transportation law, which restricted women from working over a certain number of hours—the 8-hour law—or working at night, and, you know that a railroad is a 24-hour industry. Employees must be able to work at night as well as day. Women had been working on this railroad, the Brooklyn-Manhattan, since 1888, 32 years before suffrage was won. We worked in harmony with our men, and on equal terms. We received equal pay. It was evident that we knew how to protect our own health and morals all of those years. But, as soon as suffrage was won; as soon as the women got the vote, this protective legislation came into existence, and they deemed that it was necessary to have our health and our morals protected. They drew up a bill without our knowing anything about it—a group of women in New York City—without asking the women anything about it, and brought it to our legislators, and told them there that we knew about this bill; and that we were exploited; that we were downtrodden; and that we wanted this bill. Our legislators knew nothing else, and the bill was passed. Because of their influence, overnight, as it were, it became effective. Our night women, or the majority of them, were mothers. I worked for 13 years all night long, from preference. On the railroads we have seniority. We do not have to do that if we do not want to, but we mothers were more of a mother to our children when we worked at night. When I was working on the day shift every time the ambulance passed I knew that it was one of my children. Every time I heard of a little boy being hurt I knew that it was one of mine. After children have supper, they go to bed. They tell you how the woman who works at night has two jobs. The mother who works in the daytime has two jobs—hard jobs. She is up much of the night. That is, the working woman is. I went down and pleaded with my superior to let me go back on night work, and I remained for 13 years on night work.

When you work at night the children know that you are at home in the daytime—they know that mother is home. When you are on day work they will play truant. My boys were cute enough when I was on day work to take letters out of the box that come to me from the school. My boys were playing truant, and the truant officer came there. When I was on night work they took their lunch, or they could come home, and I could do my work in God's daylight, and not under artificial light; and I got plenty of sleep. I was a happier woman. That is why mothers want to work at night, although the unmarried women will also give you legitimate reasons why they want night work.

We had been working peacefully until this law went over, and then from the B.-M. T. and the I. R. T. in New York almost 3,000 women were thrown out of work. At that time there were women who had grown old in the service, who had given 27 years of their life in service. Those, pardon me, uplifters knew of this. They knew that if those women were thrown out of work they would be useless anywhere else, but that did not faze them one bit. The public service commissioner said that if that law became effective the women would be thrown out of work, or at least, the railroad could not employ women. And it happened. Then we brought our league into existence and contributed from our wages to send our representatives to Albany, before our legislators, and before Al Smith, and the same legislators that in 1919 had passed this legislation that threw us out of work, almost to a woman. They amended the law when they heard our tale. They had believed those other women. Governor Smith signed the law, and we are working there yet, but it is only a State law. Ever since 1919 we have been constantly going before the legislators, watching every piece of legislation, afraid that this bill will be wiped off the books; afraid that we will lose our jobs.

We were not the only women who were affected at that time. Thousands were affected by the so-called protective laws—women in candy stores, ice cream parlors, drug stores, elevators, women who sold candy and magazines at the elevated and subway stops—they all lost their jobs and were thrown out of work—thousands of women. Mr. Chairman, no one can deny that I am telling you the truth. It was carried in our daily press as a headliner for weeks. Our boys Over There heard of it, and they wrote home to their mothers asking what happened, many of them who had been working on the railroad. I am telling you the absolute truth and facts, Mr. Chairman. Everyone knew about it. We asked those women who did it, why they did it, and we asked them to come to our meetings, and they ignored us. We asked, "What have you done to us?" We have lost job after job because of those laws. I was told that there was scrubbing to be done.

(Continued on page 231)

Chrystal Macmillan Memorial

By Erica Butler-Bowdon,
Geneva Representative Open Door International

IT IS fitting that the memory of Chrystal Macmillan, whose life was devoted to the emancipation of women not only in great Britain but throughout the world, should be honoured by a lasting tribute. That the memorial is to take the form of furthering the causes that she believed in will appeal to all who wish to see the political, civil, and economic equality of women with men brought nearer.

It is impossible to give an adequate idea in the following short survey of a life so full of achievement in the service of humanity.

Born in 1872 of a well known Edinburgh family, Chrystal Macmillan was the only daughter among eight sons. Her early education was in Edinburgh and at St. Leonard's School, St. Andrews. She afterwards passed to Edinburgh and Berlin universities, at the former graduating M.A. and B.Sc. with first class honours in mathematics and natural philosophy. Doubtless her brilliant intellectual powers would have brought her a career of academic distinction, but her burning zeal for justice was to carry her along other paths. On leaving the university she became associated with Mrs. Henry Fawcett in the fight for the franchise for British women. It was in 1908 that her great abilities marked her to take a leading part in a famous lawsuit to obtain the Parliamentary vote for the women graduates of the Scottish universities. The refusal of the universities to allow women graduates to vote for a Parliamentary representative caused Chrystal Macmillan and four other graduates to raise a lawsuit which however was lost in both Houses of Scottish Court of Session. But Chrystal Macmillan decided to carry the case to a further Court of Appeal—the House of Lords. There she pleaded in person in a speech lasting several hours and although the case was decided against her, her speech won praise from the presiding judge and notable counsel.

When the war came she organized the first dispatch of food for Belgian refugees in Holland. She was one of the initiators of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom at a Congress held at the Hague, and at a similar congress held in Zurich in 1919 was appointed its delegate to the Peace Conference at Versailles.

Taking advantage of the opening of the legal profession to British women, she studied law and was called to the English Bar in 1923.

In later years she worked for the right of a woman to retain her nationality on marriage. She was chairman of the Women's International Demonstration on the Nationality of Married Women held at the Hague, and chairman of the Nationality of Married Women Pass the Bill Committee. She was also an executive member of the National Council of Women, and the Association for Moral and Social Hygiene which works for a single moral standard for men and women.

One of the chief activities in her later life was her championship of the rights of the woman worker. As President of the Open Door International which she founded, she strove to abolish so-called protective laws which apply to women only, in industry, and instead to base all such protective legislation on the nature of the work and not on the sex of the worker.

Once did she stand for Parliament, as Liberal candidate at the General Election of 1935 in the constituency of N. Edinburgh, but was defeated.

In the irreplacable loss which her death means to her many friends and to the women's organizations depending on her guidance, there remains the inspiration and the memory of a charity that faltered not, of a courage that knew not dismay, and of patient service in a cause, for which she asked no recognition or reward.

Her friends and admirers have an opportunity of paying a tribute to her by subscribing to the permanent memorial in her honour. It is suggested that a memorial to record her association with the Bar of England—as a member of the Honourable Society of the Middle Temple and of the Western Circuit—should take the form of a capital sum to be offered to the Society to provide an annual prize of not less than £20 for women law students. Any remainder of the fund to be divided between four societies with whose work she was most closely identified to the last days of her life: The Open Door International, of which she was Founder and President; the Nationality of Married Women Pass the Bill Committee; the Association for Moral and Social Hygiene; the Open Door Council, being the British Branch of the Open Door International.

The Memorial has the support of many distinguished men and women throughout the world.

Subscriptions should be sent to the Honorable Treasurer, Chrystal Macmillan Memorial, Room 14, Livingstone House, Broadway, Westminster, London S. W. 1.

New Victory For Women Of France

French women recently were promised freedom from the marriage obligation to "obey" their husbands, according to an Associated Press dispatch from the French Capital. The dispatch, appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of February 14 says in part:

"The official transcript of the far-reaching civil rights bill for women was published February 12 in the Official Journal. It has been approved by both the Senate and Chamber of Deputies.

The measure, which recognizes women as the equals of men, as well as according them civil rights, now needs only the routine formalities of President Lebrun's signature and final promulgation in the Official Journal.

The act changes the Napoleonic marital law to read "the husband is the head of the family and has the choice of the family's residence," instead of "the husband owes protection to his wife and his wife obedience to her husband."

Women are authorized to have bank accounts and sign legal documents, but they cannot engage in business without the consent of their husbands.

For more than a century French wives have been the legal prisoners of their husbands under the Napoleonic dictum that "nature made women our slaves."

Under the Code Napoleon, promulgated in 1803 and the law of the land until now, a married woman, like a child, was denied civil rights.

(Continued on page 230)

Early American Pioneers Of The Woman Movement

By Mary Wilhelmine Williams,
Professor of History, Goucher College

THE EARLIEST pioneer of the Woman Movement in America was Anne Hutchinson, of the Massachusetts Bay colony. Mrs. Hutchinson had new religious ideas—which foreshadowed Quakerism—and she proceeded to express them. Soon she had a large following, including Sir Henry Vane, the colonial governor. But the general court stepped in, tried Anne Hutchinson for heresy, and ordered her banishment. Early in 1638 she settled in the Narragansett Bay region. A few years later she and most of her children were massacred by the Indians.

Margaret Brent, the first white woman to hold land in her own name in Maryland, was a feminist of another type. Margaret never married. Her sister Anne became the wife of Leonard Calvert, governor of the colony, but she died long before her husband. Leonard Calvert appointed his sister-in-law Margaret the executor of his estate, and the colonial assembly made her attorney for Lord Baltimore, so that she might collect rents in his name. These responsibilities led Margaret to ask for political rights. Regarding this, the *Maryland Archives* for January 21, 1647, has this entry:

> "Came Mistress Margaret Brent and requested to have vote in the howse for herselfe and voyce also for that at the last court . . . it was ordered that the said Mistress Brent was to be looked upon and received as his Lps. attorney. The governor denied that Mistress Brent should have any vote in the house. And the said Mistress Brent protested against all proceedings in this present assembly, unless she may be present and have vote as aforesaid."

You can see that Margaret Brent was a woman of real spirit. But her protests were in vain.

The next recorded demand by a woman for political rights came more than a century later. On March 31, 1776, when John Adams was meeting with the Continental Congress in Philadelphia, his wife Abigail wrote him thus: "I long to hear that you have declared an independency. And, by the way, in the new code of laws which I suppose it will be necessary for you to make, I desire you to remember the ladies and be more generous to them than your ancestors. Do not put such unlimited power into the hands of the husbands. Remember all men would be tyrants if they could. If particular care and attention is not paid to the ladies, we are determined to foment a rebellion, and will not hold ourselves bound by any laws in which we have no voice or representation."

But John Adams laughed at Abigail and told her that men had only the name of masters—that they were really the subjects of the women. For the next century and a half the brethren thus put off by flattery the women who asked for their just dues as human beings. When the Fathers of our Country drew up the Constitution they forgot their daughters. But the rebellion threatened by Abigail Adams did not begin until about sixty years later.

In the 1830s, two gentle Southern women became much concerned over women's rights and women's wrongs. These were Sarah and Angelina Grimké, who, because they hated slavery, had moved North to work against it. At first they talked on abolition to women gathered in private parlors, but soon they got opportunities to speak in a few churches. At the time, except in the Society of Friends, it was generally considered unseemly and bold for a woman to deliver a public address. Therefore, in 1837 the General Association of Congregational Ministers of Massachusetts published a tirade against the Grimké sisters.

This caused Sarah and Angelina to work for woman's rights, as well as for the rights of the Negro. In 1838 Sarah Grimké published a vigorous "Letter on the Equality of the Sexes and the Condition of Women." In it she declared that "the page of history teems with woman's wrongs" and "is wet with woman's tears." The Grimkés were the first women to lecture, outside of Quaker meetings, on behalf of abolition of slavery and of justice to women.

While they were beginning the woman's rights crusade, Lucy Stone, a thoughtful New England school teacher, was becoming roused. She had not liked the way her father had treated her mother, and had resented the fact that women were not permitted to vote at business meetings of the Congregational Church. When she protested against the situation, the Bible was quoted to her. "Women must keep silence in the churches," she was told; and "God is the head of man and man is the head of woman." These citations disturbed Lucy Stone, for she failed to reflect that the Bible had been written by men. But she believed that God is just. Therefore, she suspected that St. Paul's letters had been incorrectly translated. She decided to go to college and learn Greek, to satisfy herself on this point. And she went to Oberlin, the only real college at the time that would admit women. Here she seems to have found nothing wrong with the translation of the New Testament, but much that was wrong in the attitude of Oberlin toward women. Before she received her degree in 1847—one of the first college degrees held by a woman in modern times—she made up her mind to devote her life to the elevation of women; and she did so. In that same year she delivered her first public lecture on woman's rights. Soon she became one of the greatest orators of her generation.

The year after Lucy Stone started her feminist campaign, the first *organized* effort for woman's rights began. This was the indirect result of the World Anti-Slavery Convention held in London in 1840. The delegates included a few women from the United States, among them Lucretia Mott, the distinguished Quaker minister. But the convention would not recognize the women delegates, or even permit them to have seats in the main floor of the convention hall. One of the men delegates was Henry Stanton, who had recently married Elizabeth Cady, of New York. His bride—who was not a delegate—was very indignant over the exclusion of the women, and so was Lucretia Mott. They decided that it was time to do something in an organized way about the wrongs of women as well as the wrongs of the Negro. They would hold a woman's rights convention when they got home.

But the convention was delayed, for, during the next eight years, Mrs. Stanton was occupied with bearing and caring for many children, and Mrs. Mott was busy with abolition activities. Mrs. Stanton did, however, labor to improve the economic status of married women in New York. On this subject she had got ideas as a little girl. In her father's law office she had heard women seek in vain to save their property from

drunken, spendthrift husbands. Elizabeth Cady had then learned that, legally speaking, a married woman was not a person—that, according to the English jurist, William Blackstone, in the eyes of the law husband and wife were one, and that *one* was the *husband*.

As time passed Mrs. Stanton's indignation over the wrongs suffered by women grew rapidly, and in the summer of 1848 when she and Lucretia Mott again met they decided to hold the long-delayed woman's rights convention. On July 19, 1848, the meeting began, in the Wesleyan Methodist Church at Seneca Falls, New York, where Mrs. Stanton was then living. Many distinguished reformers, men and women, attended, but Elizabeth Cady Stanton was the leading and most courageous spirit of the gathering.

She was chairman of the committee which drew up an expression of opinion from the convention known as the "Declaration of Sentiments." This was based upon the Declaration of Independence, but the list of indictments was directed not against George III of England, but against the *genus homo*. The "Sentiments" noted all types of discriminations practiced by man against woman. Here are a few extracts:

"He has never permitted her to exercise her inalienable right to the elective franchise . . .

"He has made her, if married, in the eye of the law, civilly dead . . .

"He has taken from her all right in property, even to the wages she earns . . .

"He has monopolized nearly all of the profitable employments, and from those she is permitted to follow, she receives but a scanty remuneration . . .

"He had denied her the facilities for obtaining a thorough education, all colleges being closed against her . . .

"He has usurped the prerogative of Jehovah himself, claiming it as his right to assign for her a sphere of action, when that belongs to her conscience and her God."

Those attending the convention voted their determination to work until these inequalities were removed. The resolution favoring woman suffrage was introduced through the insistence of Elizabeth Cady Stanton. Lucretia Mott, fearing that it would ruin the whole movement by making it appear fanatical, protested: "Lizzie, thee will make us ridiculous!" But Mrs. Stanton, younger and more daring than her colleague, saw that the vote was the key to other rights; and the resolution was adopted. Thereafter emphasis was given to suffrage until suffrage was won.

After this meeting—which was the first woman's rights convention of modern times—the feminist movement quickly became organized and cooperative. The four giants of the early woman's rights crusade were Lucy Stone, Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Susan B. Anthony. Miss Anthony was not converted or committed to the cause until 1852, four years after the historic meeting at Seneca Falls. But after she enlisted in it she worked more continuously and more powerfully than any of the others, and she became the greatest of the nineteenth century feminists.

New Victory For Women Of France

(Continued from page 228)

A wife could have no home but her husband's. She could not acquire or distribute property without the authorization of her husband or of the courts. Virtually all the wife could do was to make her own will.

The next step in the feminist campaign for emancipation of women is expected to be concentrated on an effort to obtain the right to vote. Four times the Chamber of Deputies has approved such a bill, but each time the Senate has rejected it.

The new law providing that "the married woman has the full exercise of her civil rights," means she may inherit, earn and spend her own money, sign and witness legal documents, plead before courts in her own name and generally share with her husband in support and management of the family."

According to one Paris newspaper, "the passage of the civil rights bill by Parliament means a sort of 'juridical Fourteenth of July' for the women of France, since it signifies a successful storming of a celebrated 'anti-feminist Bastille,' the Code Napoleon, on which France's laws are based and which embodies many conceptions of ancient Roman law in regard to women . . . Little mention was made in the Paris press of the final passage of the bill. It may have been an indication that French husbands were trying to keep their wives in ignorance of the newly gained rights."

We urge National Woman's Party Members to Patronize our Advertizers. They are our friends and we recommend them.

WILMINGTON, DEL.
HOTEL DUPONT
Phone 8121 11th & Market Sts.

HOTEL ROOSEVELT
"Jacksonville's Finest"
Charles B. Greiner, *Mgr.*
JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

Alva Belmont House
NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY
Rooms available to members and friends
Capitol Hill Washington, D. C.

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.
THE STERLING
May A. Johnson, *Prop.*
Kentucky Ave., Near Beach

STRATH HAVEN INN
SWARTHMORE, PA.
One Mile South of Route No. 1
F. M. Scheibley Management

SUNRISE INN
Apartments & Cottages—A Home for the Winter
James H. Reardon, Mgr. Port Sewall, Fla.

HOTEL ROOSEVELT
Madison Ave. and 45th St.
NEW YORK CITY

"The Skyscraper by the Sea"
HOTEL CLARIDGE
ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.

Write for Special Rate
Hotel Page, Equal Rights
144 B St., N. E. Washington, D. C.

Scholars And Gentlemen

OF ALL the barred doors which woman has forced in her century's struggle to become a citizen of the world none have yielded so easily as those of the college and of Φ B K. Though for weary years she had to use intellectual battering-rams to gain admittance to the vote, to certain legal rights and to many occupations, she had only to knock politely at the academic gates to gain a diploma and a key.

The difference in her reception perhaps corresponds to that in the circles she was trying to penetrate. In the former cases she had to apply to the general society of men; in the latter to the exclusive company of scholars and gentlemen.

The centennial of woman's painless entrance into the college classroom was celebrated last fall when Oberlin dedicated a monumental gateway and amphitheatre in memory of the first four "coeds." By simply taking their places in Greek, Latin and Hebrew classes beside the boys in a small pioneering college in the Ohio forest, the four demure girls of 1837 passed into history at the head of a procession of millions of their sisters who have since forced long-barred university gates in almost every country of the globe.

For the first time in the centuries of higher education women studied the same lessons, took the same examinations and gained the same degrees as men. Thus, with hardly a murmur of opposition, women gained a realm long withheld from them, merely by accepting literally the dictum of the Oberlin founder, who announced as one of the college objectives; "the elevation of the female character, by bringing within reach of the misjudged and neglected sex all the instructive privileges which have hitherto unreasonably distinguished the leading sex from theirs."

With even less difficulty some forty years later woman strolled, by invitation, into the select scholastic company of Φ B K. The incident seems to have occurred, without outside comment, at the University of Vermont in 1875. Then at a meeting of the local Chapter two young women, Lida Mason and Ellen Hamilton, whose academic standing made them eligible for the honor, were gallantly elected to membership. At the same time a resolution was passed and communicated to other chapters that "in the opinion of this Chapter all the graduates of this University should be eligible to membership without regard to sex."

It was as easy as that, though five years later when the Cornell Chapter was founded, one Herbert Tuttle wrote to a friend, Robert Roberts, at the University of Vermont questioning the soundness of the practice as follows:

"We have just established a Chapter of the Phi Beta Kappa here, your servant being one of the founders; and we have obtained our Charter from Union College. The question of admitting women came up. It was stated that there was one precedent for it, and only one, viz: Burlington, and it was stated that the Harvard Chapter made no objection to it. I happened to know nothing about your experience at the U. V. M. and rather hastily it was voted to accept the precedent and let the fair creatures in. Personally, I have doubts about the wisdom of such a course. It seems to me in the first place absurd to admit women to a *Fraternity*, and, secondly, that the whole traditions and character of the concern make it exclusively a male affair."

Apparently Mr. Roberts stood staunchly by the ladies, thus (as was later observed) adhering to the tenet of an old constitution of the order, which holds that the "liberal principles of our Society should not be confined to any particular place, men or description of men, but should be extended to the wise and virtuous of whatever community."

Today women, with 32,905 of the sex enrolled, proudly constitute forty per cent of the living members of the Society. And with such names as Judge Florence E. Allen, Pearl Buck, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, Frances Perkins, Dr. Florence R. Sabin and Ida M. Tarbell.—*The Key Reporter of Φ B K.*

Statement Of Mary Murray Before Senate Committee

(Continued from page 227)

I was one of a committee, who sat and listened, and we were told that there was plenty of scrubbing to be done. It is this condition of us women in industry that is egging us on to revolt. We resent being put in a class apart from other women, as if we had inferior intelligence, not knowing what was good for ourselves, or for our children. That is the way they look at us. We women who have grown old in this fight for this amendment are going to keep it up, although we hope and trust that this will be the last time we will have to appear before our legislators to ask for simple justice and equal chances with men.

Perhaps we mothers and grandmothers are looking back upon the faded picture of our own ambitions. We had ambitions when we were younger, Mr. Chairman, but we were hedged in. Those ambitions are faded and destroyed beyond reclamation, but we are determined to fight on until the door of opportunity is open to our children and grandchildren through the Equal Rights Amendment.

I am a Catholic. I and my children live up to the teachings of my church. I have brought them all up that way. I belong to all the associations in my church. I am an arch promoter of the Sacred Heart League, which is considered quite an honor. The promoter of that league, a Jesuit father, told me one time when I came here to speak for the amendment:

> "You tell the priests there who are against working women, that I was in Washington, St. Aloysius Church, and I saw the women marching down Pennsylvania Avenue, stoned, insulted, and ridiculed. I never thought that I would live to see the day that they would want suffrage. Now that they have, you tell the priests in Washington who are opposed to you that the working women have the same right to industrial equality as political equality."

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to say to you, please listen to the pleas of the real working women who are here today; those who have suffered because of those so-called protective laws, and those who are suffering today. Please grant us justice. Look favorably upon the Equal Rights Amendment and vote for it.

I thank you.

TREASURER'S REPORT

LAURA M. BERRIN, Treasurer — EDNA NICK, Auditor

The last report showed Treasurer's Receipts through March, 1937. This report covers period from April, 1937, through June, 1937—exclusive of subscriptions to EQUAL RIGHTS.

APRIL, 1937

Mrs. Francis J. Allen, Conn.	$ 1.00
Miss Mary Anthony, R. I.	1.00
Mrs. Ruth D. Beals, Mass.	12.00
Mrs. John T. Bissell, N. J.	5.00
Miss Mary Boggs, D. C.	1.00
Mrs. Alfred H. Bright, Calif.	5.00
Lura Corbett Brown, Mich.	1.00
Mrs. Margaret Brown	1.00
Mrs. Blanche Colley, Mass.	4.00
Mrs. E. A. Cunningham, Calif.	1.00
Mrs. Jeanne d'Estimauville, Pa.	10.00
Mrs. M. A. Doughty, Calif.	1.00
Mrs. Flora Drummond, England	1.45
Alice Eastwood, Calif.	5.00
Mrs. Orrin Elliott, Conn.	1.00
Mrs. Bertha Fowler, N. Y.	12.00
Mrs. E. S. Gerlach, Md.	1.00
Mrs. H. B. Gessner, La.	1.00
Mrs. Mary Billings Green, Conn.	1.00
Miss Helen Grice, Pa.	1.00
Mrs. Paul Hammersmith, Wis.	1.00
Miss Virginia Hammersmith, Wis.	1.00
Mrs. G. C. Harris, S. C.	1.00
Mrs. Dale Hartman	.50
Miss Mabel Hiatt, D. C.	1.00
Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles, Del.	5.00
Mrs. Wm. Kent, Calif.	51.00
Miss Jessie Lane, D. C.	1.00
Miss E. Jeannette Love, D. C.	1.00
Mrs. Jean West Maury, D. C.	1.00
Miss Grace McGerr, D. C.	1.00
Mrs. A. J. McKie, Conn.	1.00
Beatrice Monk, Mass.	2.00
Mrs. Hazel Moore, N. Y.	.60
Mrs. Soren Mortensen, Wis.	1.00
Mrs. E. G. Norton, Conn.	1.00
Mrs. Nancy Parsons, D. C.	2.00
Miss Alice Paul, N. J.	10.00
Mrs. Stephen Pell, N. Y.	10.00
Mrs. F. L. Ransome, Calif.	20.00
Mrs. Kenyon Rector, Ohio	10.00
Miss A. Marguerite Smith, Mass.	100.00
Miss Margaret Stottlemeyer, D. C.	1.00
Mrs. Inez S. Tyler, D. C.	1.00
Mrs. Emma Townsend, Texas	1.00
Dr. Josephine VanderWolff, Ill.	1.00
Mrs. Richard Wainwright, D. C.	10.00
Miss Matilda Weber, Ohio	5.00
Helen P. Wetzel, N. J.	5.00
Mrs. T. W. Wheat, Md.	1.00
Ruth Gill Williams, Pa.	5.00
Mrs. Clara Snell Wolfe, Ohio	5.00
Shares of dues paid to National Headquarters by the following branches, balances being retained by said branches:	
Massachusetts	9.75
Government Workers' Council	28.75
Maryland	.25
New York Committee	11.25
Ohio	9.50
Delaware	25.00
Rent of Rooms at Headquarters	274.50
Total Receipts during April, 1937	$ 682.55

MAY, 1937

Mrs. Nina Allender, D. C.	$ 10.00
Mrs. A. H. Bright, Calif.	5.00
Mrs. A. C. Chew, D. C.	1.00
Mrs. Alberta Comer, Ohio	1.50
Mrs. Charles Cutler, Conn.	1.00
Mrs. Victor du Pont, Del.	12.00
Miss Isabel Drummond, Pa.	1.00
Martha Gasch, Oregon	1.00
Thomas Gray (In memory of his wife, Emma Pauline Gray)	5.00
Emma T. Hahm, D. C.	12.00
Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles	25.00
Mrs. Wm. Kent, Calif.	26.00
Mary O. Kryszas, Wis.	1.00
Mrs. Edwin Lobdell, Ill.	4.00
Mrs. Hazel McCartney, Ohio	5.00
Mrs. Grace Hathaway Miller, D. C.	5.00
Mrs. Alice Palmer, N. J.	1.00
Mrs. Stephen Pell, N. Y.	10.00
Mrs. Frances Peterson, Mass.	3.00
Miss Carol Rehfish, Calif.	10.00
Miss Florence Rosenstein, N. Y.	1.00
Mrs. Minnie B. Ross, D. C.	1.00
Mrs. Joseph G. Shapiro, Conn.	1.00
Mrs. Caroline B. Stephen, D. C.	3.00
Miss Berenice Shibeley, Ohio	2.50
Miss Catherine Stolz, Ohio	1.00
Mrs. Richard Wainwright, D. C.	1.00
Mrs. Valentine Winters, Ohio	25.00
Miscellaneous Receipts	9.71
Shares of dues paid to National Headquarters by the following branches, balances being retained by said branches:	
Massachusetts	5.00
Syracuse, New York	4.50
Delaware County Branch, Pennsylvania	6.50
Michigan	4.00
Virginia	12.50
New York City Committee	83.25
Philadelphia City Branch, Pennsylvania	18.75
Dayton, Ohio	4.25
New Mexico	3.50
Maryland	33.25
Rent of Rooms at Headquarters	216.60
Total Receipts during May, 1937	$ 576.81

JUNE, 1937

Anonymous	$ 1.00
Mrs. William M. Barnes, Pa.	12.00
Miss Hazel Bartlett, D. C.	1.00
Anna M. Behling, D. C.	1.00
Mrs. Frederick Bergmann, D. C.	1.00
Mrs. Victoria L. Bergmann, D. C.	1.00
Miss Rita Beuchert, D. C.	1.00
Mrs. Anna B. Clancy, D. C.	1.00
Miss Gertrude Crocker, Va.	1.00
Miss Emily I. Farnum, D. C.	10.00
Mrs. Edith Fitch, Wis.	1.00
Mrs. Mary H. Fortier, D. C.	1.00
Miss Eloise M. Garton, Pa.	1.00
Mrs. E. S. Gerlach, Md.	2.00
Mrs. Eli H. Griffith, D. C.	1.00
Miss Sara Grogan, D. C.	10.00
Mrs. L. J. Harris, D. C.	1.00
Miss Carrie Harrison, D. C.	1.00
Miss Emma F. Hayward, D. C.	1.00
Mrs. Jennie Helbing, Calif.	1.00
Mrs. Arthur Hill, Mo.	1.00
Mrs. F. B. Hilles, Del.	7.00
Mrs. Wm. Kent, Calif.	26.00
Mrs. Lola Maverick Lloyd, Ill.	50.00
Miss Alma Lutz, Mass.	25.00
Mrs. Lela Marshall, D. C.	1.00
Miss Marion May, N. Y.	50.00
Mrs. Belle Moll, D. C.	1.00
Mrs. Hazel Moore, N. J.	1.00
Miss Marie Moss, D. C.	1.00
Mrs. W. F. Peck, Md.	1.00
Mrs. Stephen Pell, N. Y.	15.00
Miss Amy Putnam, D. C.	1.00
Miss Myrl Rhine, D. C.	1.00
Mrs. Jane Norman Smith, N. Y.	12.00
Mrs. Helen Stewart, D. C.	1.00
Mrs. Sara K. Terry, D. C.	1.00
Mrs. Jessie F. Thomas, D. C.	1.00
Mrs. Grace Hoffman White, N. Y.	100.00
Mrs. Pope Yeatman, Pa.	52.00
Committee on Equal Economic Opportunity:	
Mrs. Grace Key Long, N. Y.	5.00
Mrs. Wm. Kent, Calif.	50.00
Mrs. Grace Hoffman White, N. Y.	25.00
Miss Marion May, N. Y.	25.00
Mrs. Esther F. Marks	5.00
Shares of dues paid to National Headquarters by the following branches, balances being retained by said branches:	
Ohio	.50
Massachusetts	1.00
Missouri	3.25
Kentucky	1.75
Rent of Rooms at Headquarters	119.67
Commission on Telephone	.52
Sale of Literature	3.40
Sale of Equal Rights	.05
Total Receipts during June, 1937	$ 638.14

Publications Available

Significance of Equal Rights Amendment 50 for $1	$ .05
The Equal Rights Amendment: The Practical Solution 50 for $.25	.01
Working Women Speak 50 for $1	.05
A Few Facts About the National Woman's Party 50 for $.25	.01
Equality Versus Protection 50 for $1	.05
The Equal Rights Treaty Versus the Women's Charter 50 for $.50	.02
Beware of the Women's Charter 50 for $.50	.02
The Women's Charter of Inequality 50 for $.50	.02
The Case for Women Jurors 50 for $3.75	.10
A Comparison of the Political and Civil Rights of Men and Women in the United States 100 for $15	.20
The Equal Rights Amendment 50 for $2	.05
Pass the Equal Rights Amendment Now 50 for $.50	.02
Constitutional Rights of Women 50 for $.25	.01
How Long Will Women Wait for Liberty? 50 for $1.75	.05
Recent Hearings on Equal Rights Amendment Before Senate Judiciary Committee 10 copies for $1.00	.15

Send Orders to ALMA LUTZ

144 B Street, Northeast — *National Woman's Party* — Washington, D. C.